



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

W
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/561,086	10/19/2006	Derrick Anthony Rhodes	37891.2	2472
27683	7590	11/27/2007	EXAMINER	
HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 Main Street Suite 3100 Dallas, TX 75202				HARTMANN, GARY S
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		3671		
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
		11/27/2007		
		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/561,086	RHODES, DERRICK ANTHONY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary Hartmann	3671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the means adapted to facilitate raising of the frame must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang (U.S. Patent 5,054,956).

Huang discloses a utility portal frame (7) including means to facilitate raising of the frame (Figure 3, for example).

Regarding claim 8, lifting is done in order to match a new pavement height (abstract, for example).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3-7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rego (U.S. Patent 1,071,577) in view of Huang (U.S. Patent 5,993,106).

Rego discloses the frame (11) configured as claimed (Figures 1 and 2). Rego does not disclose the jack/raising means. Huang teaches using a jack (51) in order to lift a manhole element. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to have used a jack/raising means in order to raise the frame of Rego in order to more easily perform the operation as needed, in accordance with the teaching of Huang.

Rego teaches a round configuration; however, it is common to use other shapes in order to suit a particular application, as exemplified by Huang (Figure 14A, for example). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured Rego as a rectangle, as shown by Huang.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rego and Huang '106, as applied above, and further in view of Huang '956, as applied above.

Rego is silent regarding matching a new pavement level. It is well known to elevate a utility portal frame when repaving in order to match the new pavement height, as taught by Huang '956. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have provided a means for raising Rego to match the height of a newly paved surface in order to obtain a finished flush surface, in accordance with the teaching of Huang '956.

Claims 5, 7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang '956 as applied above, and further in view of Huang '106, as applied above.

Huang '956 teaches a round configuration; however, it is common to use other shapes in order to suit a particular application, as exemplified by Huang '106 (Figure 14A, for example). For this reason, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured Huang '956 as a rectangle, as shown by Huang '106.

Regarding claim 9, Huang '956 is deemed to be sized to fit a human. Further, it is common to use manholes (which are inherently sized to fit a human) in road surfaces, as exemplified by Huang '106. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have configured Huang '956 to allow a human to fit through the frame in order to provide access for humans to underground structures, as is the purpose of manholes such as that of Huang '106.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10 October 2007 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Applicant has changed the functional language to positively recited elements; therefore, a new rejection has been made. The Huang references also demonstrate that examiner's statements in the non-final action regarding what is within ordinary skill were correct.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary Hartmann whose telephone number is 571-272-6989. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday, 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gh



GARY S. HARTMANN
PRIMARY EXAMINER